IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):   Donald C. Likes, Russell C. Brown

Assignee: Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.

Title: Communication Scheme-Independent Infrastructure

Serial No.:   10/085,965   Filing Date: February 28, 2002

Examiner: Kevin T. Bates   Group Art Unit: 2155

Docket No.:   TT3973   Customer No.:   53362

<div style="text-align:right">

Austin, Texas
April 14, 2008

</div>

Electronically Filed
Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR § 1.193

Dear Sir:

Applicants submit this Reply Brief pursuant to the Examiner's Answer mailed in this case on February 14, 2008. It is believed that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this Reply Brief, however, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct any amounts required for this Reply Brief and to credit any amounts overpaid to Deposit Account No. 502264.

In response to Applicants arguments, the Examiner sets forth:

> The examiner relies on the teachings of Man, not Glass to teach the communication scheme indication portion in the message. Man teaches in Column 2, lines 42-44 that the message from the first application to the second includes a block of protocol specific information. Figures 9 and 10 and Column 12, line 40-Column 13, line 10 teach that the message includes communication specific information for address data (Column 12, lines 48-54) and packet header information (Column 12, lines 44-49). So clearly shown in Man, the protocol communication scheme is indicated in the message header of the message being communicated between applications and that communication indicate portion is stored along with the source and destination information (Figures 10A, 10B, and 10C) (Examiner's Answer, Page 6).

However, neither Man nor Glass, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest *a resource locator* that includes a communication scheme indication portion as disclosed and

claimed in the present application. Merely disclosing a Universal Resource Locator, even in combination with Man, does not disclose or suggest *a resource locator* which includes *a communication scheme indication portion.* Accordingly, the combination of Man and Glass would not enable a communication infrastructure that allows the specific communication schemes that are being used to be isolated from the application programs such that the application programs are not dependent upon a particular communication scheme, as is the case with the present invention.

In response to Applicants arguments, the Examiner further set forth:

> The appellant seems to be misinterpreting the combination of Man and Glass, since Glass is not being relied upon to teach the teaching of both the first and second locator.
>
> Man teaches a message packet that includes source and destination identifier and socket number (Figure 10B). The source and destination node's identify the first and second application or components in the network. What Man is lacking is the idea that the first and second locators identifying the source and destination are resource locator including the node name, port, and path.
>
> Glass teaches a messaging system which includes the teaching that conventional URL information can be used to identifying components in a messaging system (Column 4, lines 4-8). Glass teaches that the URL includes the node name (Dallas), port name (8000), and path names (Store1) (Column 4, lines 1; lines 4-8) (Examiner's Answer, Page 7).

However, neither Man nor Glass, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest communicating a message from the first component to a second component where the communicating includes using *a first resource locator to identify the first component and using a second resource locator to identify the second component* much less such communicating where the first resource locator includes *a first resource locator communication scheme indication portion,* a first resource locator *network node name indication portion,* a first resource locator port identifier indication portion and a first resource locator path indication portion and the second resource locator includes *a second resource locator communication scheme indication portion,* a second resource locator *network node name indication portion,* a second resource locator port identifier indication portion and a second resource locator path indication portion, as required by claims 1, 10 and 18.

-2-

For the above reasons as well as those set forth in the Appeal Brief, Applicants respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections of Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 15, 17 - 23, 25, and 26 are unfounded and should be reversed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on April 14, 2008.

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Stephen A. Terrile
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,946